

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| | | , | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 09/902,026 | 07/10/2001 | Suhayya Abu-Hakima | 8303/3 | 9283 |
| | 7590 12/21/200 BOEHNEN HULBEI | or RT & BERGHOFF LLP | EXAM | INER |
| | 300 S. WACKER DRIVE | | HANNE, SARA M | |
| 32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| • | | | 2179 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/21/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Interview Summary | 09/902,026 | ABU-HAKIMA ET AL. | | | | |
| interview Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Sara M. Hanne | 2179 | | | | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO | personnel): | | | | | |
| (1) Sara M. Hanne. | (3) | | | | | |
| (2) Lynn Cassan. | (4) | | | | | |
| Date of Interview: <u>14 December 2007</u> . | | • | | | | |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative] | | | | | | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: | e)⊠ No. | | | | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> . | | | | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: | | | | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) \square N/A. | | | | | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) | | | | | | |
| THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | • | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: There has been much confusion as to the intended amendment of 8/14/07. It appears that the Claims dated 8/14/07 were intended to be the current set of claims at hand since the top of the page of Claims (dated by Cassan Maclean's header Aug. 14 2007) reads "This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:" and was accompanied by remarks also dated 8/14/07. However, Ms. Cassan states that these claims were presented in order to indicate that this set of claims was the same set of claims filed 8/23/06 and that the ones on record at the pto had been scanned into the system improperly, without all of the markings, further stating that this is why she felt the Notice of Noncompliance was justified. The examiner does not have the resources to determine whether the claims were scanned or faxed in improperly and can only respond to the set of claims on record. A request to withdraw finality may be presented by Ms. Cassan for further investigation to be made by another party at the PTO.